



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,524	12/09/2003	Kenji Hasegawa	542-012.004	3724

4955 7590 01/02/2008  
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP  
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5  
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224  
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER
----------

VARGOT, MATHIEU D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1791

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/02/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/731,524	HASEGAWA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Mathieu D. Vargot	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2007.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese document 10-138,405 in view of Japanese Kokai 62-101,421 and Takeuchi et al essentially for reasons of record noting the following.

As noted previously, Japanese –405 discloses winding a PVA film onto a roller wherein the roller itself has the instant Shore A hardness. The primary reference lacks a showing of the winding hardness of the film, the thickness of the film, using a metallic core and a length of film wound being at least 1,000 meters. The secondary reference Japanese Kokai –421 teaches the instant winding hardness and winding a film that is up to 25 microns in thickness. It is submitted that the exact thickness would have been within the skill level of the art and that the instant thickness of from 30-90 microns would have been obvious over 25 microns. Takeuchi et al is still being applied to teach a metal roller and employing a wound film length of at least 1,000 meters, such shown in the reference to be a conventional length.

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese document 10-138,405 in view of Japanese Kokai 62-101,421 and Takeuchi et al and further in view of Japanese document P3075431 essentially for reasons of record as set forth in paragraph 1, supra and paragraph 2 of the previous action.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of the amendment, the rejection has been reformatted to some extent.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are obvious over the applied art.

Takeuchi et al is no longer the secondary reference, such being replaced with Japanese –421 which clearly teaches a wound film roll with the instant hardness and discloses that the method provides a film with "high dimensional stability" and that "flatness without wrinkling" is maintained. It is believed that such is occurring primarily due to the winding of the film onto the roll and that such would have been the result of a PVA film being wound to the same roll hardness. There really is noting on record to indicate that such is not so. Admittedly the polymer films are not the same, and perhaps PET films would be easier to wind than PVA films, as suggested by applicant, due to the differences in their properties. However, **once wound**, the teaching of the roll hardness for the PET film in Japanese –421 is submitted to be applicable to other wound films. In other words, the winding hardness taught in Japanese –421 is submitted to be applicable to the winding of other films --in the sense that one would wind these other films to the same roll hardness taught therein -- and would certainly provide the same benefits—ie, stability and flatness without wrinkling—when other films are wound to this hardness. Takeuchi et al is now being relied upon to teach the film length and roller material, these aspects being rather conventional in the art. Applicant's summary comments are noted but are not persuasive. It is the very fact that the instant film roll winding hardness is known in the art that makes the claims unpatentable.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot  
December 21, 2007

*M. Vargot*  
Mathieu D. Vargot  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1791

12/21/07